(c) the measures taken to popularize the procedure for filling objections to make rural people aware of their democratic rights?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI P.C. THOMAS): (a) to (c) The Election Commission *vide* its order dated 27th March, 2003 had directed that information regarding criminal antecedents, assets and liabilities and education of candidates, have to be supplied in the form of an affidavit alongwith his/her nomination paper. The information so furnished by each candidate in the aforesaid affidavit shall be disseminated by the respective returning officers by displaying a copy of the affidavit on the notice board of his office and also by making the copies thereof available freely and liberally to all other candidates and the representatives of the print and electronic media. If any rival candidate furnishes information to the contrary, by means of a duly sworn affidavit, then such affidavit of the rival candidate shall also be disseminated along with the affidavit of the candidate concerned. The Election Commission had directed that the Commission's order mentioned above should be given widest publicity through all media of mass communication, print as well as electronic media for information of general public and electors.

Recommendations of Delhi High Court

2117. SHRI VIJAY J. DARDA: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware of the recommendations made by Delhi High Court that "Responsibility of court administration should be left to the judiciary and that the Government should have no control over it" and "That judiciary is blamed for all the failures in the administration of justice whereas control over appointment of judges and financial component of the justice delivery mechanism, remains with Government"; and

(b) if so, the Government's reaction thereto?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI P.C. THOMAS): (a) and (b) The Delhi High Court in its judgment in a Criminal Case, Crl. M(M) No. 2686/2003 observed that the Government should transfer the responsibility of court administration

exclusively to the judiciary as ultimately the public blames the judiciary for all ills and failures of administration of justice though the entire control about availability of judges, supply of administrative component and financial sanction vests in the Government.

The above observation arose out of an appeal filed by a private party for summary disposal of a cheque bouncing case under Section 138 of Negotiable Instrument Act.

Articles 233, 234 and 235 of the Constitution provide ample power to the High Court of the concerned State in matters of administration of subordinate courts such as appointment of district judges, recruitment of persons other than district judges, the control over district courts and courts subordinate to it including posting and promotion and the grant of leave to persons belonging to the judicial service.

In view of the above, no action was considered necessary on the observation of the Delhi High Court and it was noted for future reference only.

Development Project for Ports

2118. MS. PRAMILA BOHIDAR:
SHRI B.J. PANDA:

Will the Minister of SHIPPING be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Prime Minister has unveiled development project for ports;

(b) if so, the details thereof and the outlay involved;

(c) the details of the ports to be developed in Orissa indicating the outlay sanctioned for the purpose; and

(d) whether Government also propose to set up new ports on the East Coast; if so, the details of the ports which would be developed in the State?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SHIPPING (SHRI DILIPKUMAR MANSUKHLAL GANDHI): (a) and (b) Yes, Sir. On the occasion of the 56th anniversary of India's Independence, the Hon'ble